

of the bad reputation of his place of business. He went on selling without the license, was arrested, obtained a writ of *habeas corpus* from the Circuit Court and was discharged from custody. The Court held that the municipal ordinance under which he was arrested, and which authorized the Police Commissioners to issue or withhold liquor licenses at discretion, was unconstitutional because it denied to the prisoner the equal protection of the laws, in that it made his business dependent upon the will of those officers.

The court of last resort reversed the decision and remanded the defendant back to the custody of the State. The opinion was given by Judge Field, a sound Democrat and usually consistent and clear in his views and their expression. The Court held that the States have absolute control of the liquor traffic within their own borders. It is, they said, a matter of local police regulation with which the Federal Government has nothing to do, except in regard to its tax for revenue. The extent and limits of the sale of liquor to be drunk on the premises form a question of public expediency and public morality and not of Federal law. The Court said further:

"There is no inherent right of a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail; it is not a privilege of a citizen of the State or a citizen of the United States. In the prohibition or regulation of the traffic discretion may be vested in officers to decide to whom to grant and to whom to refuse liquor licenses. The officer may not always exercise the power conferred upon them with wisdom or justice to the parties affected, but that is a matter which does not affect the authority of the State, or one which can be brought under the cognizance of the courts of the United States."

This decision is far more satisfactory and, it appears to us, more in consonance with the principles of States rights, than the "original package" decision, which, brought up in another form, may yet be reversed or modified. For the "court with the last guess" does occasionally correct its own errors and completely reverse its own rulings.

According to this decision, not only may States regulate the liquor traffic, restrict it, say under what conditions it may or what it may not be carried on, but they may prohibit it altogether. As to the wisdom or expediency of prohibition, of course this ruling says and effects nothing. Different persons and parties will hold different views on that question. But the power of the States in reference to it is now

legally established. Their right to prohibit is judicially settled. This is, no doubt, a step favorable to the prohibitionists, but it does not advance their arguments or give strength to their theories. However, it fortifies the States in their powers of local self-government, and that is a matter for general congratulation, because it is vital to the great Republic, the safety and permanence of which are dear to the heart of every patriotic citizen.

THE DEMOCRATIC TIDAL WAVE.

THE Democratic tidal wave which swept over the country at the beginning of the present month is justly regarded as a political phenomenon. Nothing so overwhelming of its kind has occurred since the establishment of the nation. It was generally unexpected. There were a few leading thinkers, however, who appear to have anticipated just about what occurred. Among them was the veteran scientist and philosopher J. Rodes Buchanan, of Boston. That gentleman claims to be able to predict with almost absolute certainty, from a scientific basis, future events of great moment. The principle upon which he founds his conclusions is periodicity. He claims that the United States has three distinct periods of calamity, two of which have passed, the third, he asserts, is approaching. It is entitled by him the coming cataclysm.

In treating upon the causes leading up to the social convulsions he predicts, he cites the financial demoralization and discontent which permeates the granger population of the Western States, which have operated, through the Farmers' Alliance, to produce the recent tremendous Democratic victory. He quotes, in his article, written last May and published in the August number of the *Arena*, some of the incendiary statements that have appeared in the public journals, among which is the following:

"When the gang that calls itself the government of the United States, loans \$60,000,000 of money raked in from overtaxed farmers and business men to the national banks without usury or interest, and the bankers loan it out, through confidential agents, to struggling farmers in the west, at two per cent a month, we don't see why the government does not more completely organize to enslave labor."

The sentiments expressed by Kansas farmers at a meeting held in Ottawa County, Kansas, was still more revolutionary in its tone. The *Non-Conformist*, of Winfield, Kansas, May 1st, 1890, reported it as follows:

"Enemies, traitors, are the lawmakers of the last twenty-eight years. No more petitions, no more prayers, but demands that call for action or blood. Give your people relief or answer the consequences. No more taxes or interest after December 1st."

Should this threat be carried out, December 1st being close at hand, a dangerous condition is approaching. These words imply deep-seated rage, and when anger is aroused reason takes its flight.

At another mass meeting held in the same State, on April 7th, 1890, a number of significant resolutions were adopted. After a lengthy preamble, consisting of what purports to be a statement of facts and grievances, the whole, including the following, was adopted:

"Resolved, That after the first day of December, 1890, we will pay no more taxes, coupon interest, or mortgage indebtedness, unless the government aids us in procuring the money, as above mentioned, or in any other manner equally favorable.

"Resolved, That this organization of home defenders should be general throughout the United States, and that every honorable means should be used in pushing the organization.

"Resolved, That the success of this organization is the only hope of a mortgage-cursed and tax-ridden people, and we appeal to our brother farmers, laborers, and other producers, to join us in our efforts to be free."

The paper that reported the meeting was illustrated by a picture of a Congressman making promises to the people, betraying them at Washington, and on his return seized, tarred, feathered and hung.

In the *Forum*, some time since, William Barry quoted Bishop Spalding, who said: "Our rich men, and they are numerous and their wealth is great, their number and their wealth will increase—but our rich men must do their duty or perish. I tell you in America we will not tolerate vast wealth in the hands of men who do nothing for the people."

These evidences of popular wrath and discontent are cited by Prof. Buchanan to show that a climax is approaching, and he holds that they are corroborative of his prediction of a coming social cataclysm. As a matter of course, justly or otherwise, the burden of blame is necessarily cast upon the party in power, and the result of the recent elections, to which this feeling of anger and dissatisfaction largely contributed, is an object lesson to the rulers and rich men of the nation.

We stated that Prof. Buchanan was among these who anticipated an overturning in the field of politics. As an evidence of this we will quote from his article:

"The people have left the govern-